



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,260	07/14/2003	Srimanth Gunturi	5577-260	9972

20792 7590 03/22/2007
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC
PO BOX 37428
RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER

TRAN, TUYETLIEN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/619,260	GUNTURI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/14/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3, 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 3, 10 and 17 recite the limitation "the direction" in line 6 of the claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al (Patent No. US 6252592 B1, hereinafter King) in view of Rowe et al (Patent No 5623613, hereinafter Rowe).

As to claim 1, King teaches:

A method for displaying a plurality of visual elements associated with a computer program application (e.g., see Fig. 2 and col. 3 lines 53-67), said method comprising:

defining a sequential tabbing order for the plurality of visual elements (e.g., see col. 3 lines 53-67 and Fig. 2); and

displaying at least one graphical linking element with the plurality of visual elements (e.g., see Fig. 2; note that labels 1-7 represent the tab association between visual elements "name" to "delete" which is interpreted as graphical linking element), wherein the at least one graphical linking element represents the sequential tabbing order (e.g., see col. 3 lines 53-67 and Fig. 2).

However, King does not expressly teach that the graphical linking element extending between the plurality of visual elements.

In the same field of endeavor of providing graphical indication of the directions of the next focus item (e.g., see Rowe Figs. 2-8 and col. 8 lines 38-5), Rowe teaches using graphical arrow tabs 67 (e.g., Figs. 2-8) that are appended to the sides of the focus visual element (e.g., 60 in Fig. 2) to provide an indication of the direction that the focus frame can be moved to the next visual elements (e.g., see Rowe Figs. 2-8 and col. 8 lines 38-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the graphical linking elements extending between the plurality of visual elements as taught by Rowe to the method of displaying the tabbing order as taught by King to enable a user or developer to identify the tabbing order for the visual elements. The motivation

to combine Rowe's teaching with King's teaching is to make it easier and convenient for a developer to view and set the tabbing order associating with a particular visual element in order to insure the accuracy of the tabbing order (e.g., see King col. 3 lines 4-10).

As to claim 8, claim 8 reflects the system for displaying on a display device a plurality of visual elements associated with a computer program application (e.g., see King Figs. 1-2 and col. 1 lines 6-10), the system comprising means for performing the method steps as claimed in claim 1, and are rejected along the same rationale.

As to claim 15, claim 15 reflects a computer program product for displaying a plurality of visual elements associated with a computer program application, computer program product comprising computer readable program code (e.g., see King col. 13 lines 14-19) configured for performing the method steps as claimed in claim 1, and are rejected along the same rationale.

As to claims 2, 9 and 16, King further teaches:

displaying a first graphical linking element in the sequential tabbing order that associates the first visual element and a second visual element (e.g., see labels 1, 2 and elements "name" and "address" in Fig. 2)

displaying a second graphical linking element in the sequential tabbing order that associates the second visual element and a third visual element (e.g., see labels 2, 3 and elements "address" and blank field in Fig. 2)

Rowe further teaches:

displaying a first graphical linking element extending between a first visual element in the sequential order and a second visual element in the sequential order (e.g., see arrow tab 67 in Fig. 2; note that the arrow tab 67 extends between visual elements "Sports" and "Basketball");
and

displaying a second graphical linking element extending between the second visual element and a third visual element (e.g., see arrow tab 67 in Fig. 3; note that the arrow tab in Fig. 3 extends between visual elements "Basketball" and "Bowling Football").

Thus, combining King's and Rowe would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1, 8 and 15 above.

As to claims 3, 10 and 17, King further teaches numerically labeling the visual elements on the user interface in the sequential tabbing order (e.g., see Fig. 2).

Rowe further teaches:

a line segment that extends between and graphically connects a first visual element in the sequential order and a second visual element in the sequential order (e.g., see arrow tab 67 in Fig. 2; note that the arrow tab 67 extends between visual elements "Sports" and "Basketball"); and

a graphical element that indicates the direction of the sequential tabbing order between the first and second visual elements (e.g., see arrow tab 67 in Fig. 2 that connect visual elements "Sports" and "Basketball").

Thus, combining King's and Rowe would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1, 8 and 15 above.

As to claims 4, 11 and 18, King further teaches displaying a plurality of textual order tags such that each of the textual order tags is located adjacent a respective one of the plurality of visual elements and includes text indicating a relative rank of the respective one of the plurality of visual elements in the sequential tabbing order (e.g., see King Fig. 2 and col. 3 lines 53-67).

As to claims 7, 14 and 21, King further teaches defining a second sequential tabbing order for the plurality of visual elements (e.g., “add” and “delete” may form a second tabbing group, see col. 4 lines 1-13), wherein the first sequential tabbing order includes a first visual element not in the second sequential tabbing order (e.g., note that the first sequential tabbing order includes “name”, “address”, “telephone” and “credit card” which are not included in the second tabbing order as mentioned above, see col. 4 lines 1-13), and the second sequential tabbing order includes a second visual element not in the first sequential tabbing order (e.g., see col. 4 lines 1-13);

displaying a first graphical linking element associating the first visual element and another of the plurality of visual elements, wherein the first graphical linking element represents at least a portion of the first sequential tabbing order (e.g., a distinct tabbing order may be defined within each tabbing group, see col. 4 lines 1-13); and

displaying a second graphical linking element associating the second visual element and another of the plurality of visual elements, wherein the second graphical linking element represents at least a portion of the second sequential tabbing order (e.g., a distinct tabbing order may be defined within each tabbing group, see col. 4 lines 1-13).

Rowe further teaches:

using graphical arrow tabs 67 (e.g., Figs. 2-8) that are appended to the sides of the focus visual element (e.g., 60 in Fig. 2) to provide an indication of the direction that the focus frame can be moved to the next visual elements (e.g., see Rowe Figs. 2-8 and col. 8 lines 38-5).

Thus, combining King's and Rowe would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1, 8 and 15 above.

4. Claims 5-6, 12-13, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King in view of Rowe and further in view of Cox et al (published paper "Grouping objects for Tabbing and Cursoring in Visual Programming", 05/05/1995, pp 561-563; hereinafter Cox).

As to claims 5, 12 and 19, King and Rowe teach the limitations of claims 1, 8 and 15 for the same reasons as discussed above. King further teaches changing the tabbing order of the visual elements in a user interface for an application (e.g., see King col. 2 lines 61-65); however, King and Rowe do not expressly teach that reconfiguring the at least one graphical linking element to reflect a new sequential tabbing order responsive to a modification of the sequential tabbing order.

Cox teaches reconfiguring the at least one graphical linking element to reflect a new sequential tabbing order responsive to a modification of the sequential tabbing order (e.g., see Cox page 562 and Figs. 3a and 3b). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the feature of reconfiguring at least one graphical linking element to reflect a new sequential tabbing order as taught by Cox to the method of displaying the tabbing order as taught by King and Rowe to enable a user or developer to modify the tabbing order for the visual elements. The motivation to combine King's and Rowe's with Cox's comes from the suggestion in King's (e.g., see King col. 4 lines 5-13).

As to claims 6, 13 and 20, Cox further teaches modifying the sequential tabbing order responsive to user input relocating the at least one graphical linking element relative to at least one of the plurality of visual elements (e.g., see Cox page 562 and Figs. 3a and 3b). Thus, combining King's and Rowe's with Cox's would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 5, 12 and 19 above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action.

Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns, line numbers, and figures in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teaching of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00, off on alternating Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

T.T
3/7/2007


WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Lien Tran
Examiner
Art Unit 2179